

STATE OF WASHINGTON

DEPARTMENT OF ENTERPRISE SERVICES

1500 Jefferson, Olympia, WA 98504

WASHINGTON STATE BUILDING CODE COUNCIL

Improving the built environment by promoting health, safety and welfare

DRAFT MINUTES CARBON MONOXIDE ALARM TAG MAY 6, 2013

Date: May 6, 2013

Location: Conference Call; WebEx available **Monitor Location:** DES Building, Washington

TAG members participating:

- Dave Kokot, P.E., Chair (Fire Protection Engineer/City of Spokane)
- Gary Allsup (Building Inspector/City of Lacey);
- Al Spaulding (Washington DOH/Construction Review Services));
- Julie Johnson (Director/Phillips Residential Group/Rental Housing Association)
- Tracey Locke (Senior Manager/Seattle Housing Authority)
- Mark Murray (Assistant Director/UW Environmental Health & Safety)
- Joe Puckett (Director of Government Affairs/Washington Multi-Family Housing Association)
- Rodney Schauf (Director of Engineering/Westin Hotel Seattle/Washington Lodging Association)

Absent:

• Cal Clausen; Jackie Clower; Neil Hampson, M.D.; Heidi Scarpelli; Barbara Moilien; Mark Ossewaade; Julie Martin; Jim Williams

Staff present:

• Joanne McCaughan; Tim Nogler

Introductions:

TAG Chair Dave Kokot welcomed the group to the telephone conference call; he noted they would need to complete their review of the two proposals submitted today, with the TAG recommendations to be made to the Council in June. A quorum was present. It was noted that neither proponent for either of the proposals was available to participate in the TAG meeting.

Review and Approve Agenda:

The agenda was approved as written.

Tracy asked about the process, and how an amendment would be effective for an existing occupancy, since the current rule requires those occupancies be equipped with CO alarms. Dave reviewed the process for rule adoption, and the transition time taken for retroactive rule enforcement, using the nightclub sprinkler rule as an example.

Proposal Review:

<u>Log 13-001: Exception for DOC Prisons and Work Releases</u>: submitted by Jack Olson, PE/Dept. of Corrections. This proposal would exempt 'DOC prisons and work releases' from the requirement to install CO alarms in R-2 occupancies.

TAG Discussion:

The TAG briefly discussed whether the request for exemption in this proposal was in reference to existing buildings or only intended for new construction. Joe P. stated they had not cited the correct code section to indicate existing buildings. He believes that was their intent, and it should be considered. Rodney S. and Al S. noted that the current exemptions are really intended for 'supervised environments' such as hotels/motels and college dormitories. Joe P. believes it is within the intent of the existing exceptions but the proposal would need modification to include exceptions in Chapter 46. Gary A. spoke about the enforcement issue from the local building department perspective; he feels that making the change would be unenforceable. He advises that this proposal should be set aside; he cited the reason as being that we should not be out of compliance with the model codes at the national level, where the issue has been fully vetted.

Dave K. informed the group that prison facilities are not R occupancies, they are Group I; under the new 2012 codes the I classification is included in the CO Alarm requirements, they are not exempted. We did not amend that in a way that would remove the requirements for Group I, so they are required to install alarms. There was some discussion of the nature of supervision, and whether doors are controlled, and what kind of on-site staff supervision is present in the 'work release' facilities.

Joe P. asked whether a cell is technically 'a sleeping or dwelling unit.' Dave noted that yes, they would be so classified, similar to a DSHS facility. Tim thinks it is critical that we clarify the intent of the modification request and what the consequences would be. Julie J. checked the DOC website for more information, it appears they are closely monitored facilities. Dave wanted to know if it is 24/7 staff on-site monitoring, because our exceptions are only in those cases where there is direct supervision of residents, e.g., college dorms and certain DSHS licensed facilities. Mark does not believe it is part of the mission of the TAG to review Group I; Dave K. noted it is in our scope now, even though originally it was not. That is due to changes in the base code that added Group I to these rules.

Tim added that the question is focused on Group R, and whether or not to add those DOC facilities to the exceptions. Al S. agrees that the concept could be put in place as another element of 'supervised facilities.' Tracy compared it to other supervised facilities like nursing homes.

Mark Murray made a motion to adopt the language as proposed, with the inclusion of both new construction and existing facilities (add 2012 IFC 1103.9). The group reached consensus to recommend approval of this proposal and to include the wording in the existing code sections.

The TAG also wanted the proponent to clarify under what circumstances various DOC facilities are considered R-2 occupancy, and who made that determination. Staff will contact the proponent with a request for clarification and to inform him of the upcoming meetings of the Standing Committee and the Council.

<u>Log 13-002: CO Alarms in Condos</u>: submitted by Nita Rhinehart. This proposal would exempt certain condominiums from the requirements to install CO alarms.

TAG Discussion:

There was discussion on the R-2 classification; Julie J. suggested that alarms should not be required until a sale occurs, as she was of the opinion that these should be treated the same as single family homes. Dave K. noted that

exemption is only for single family homes under current statutes; Julie recognized that that would take additional legislative action. Mark noted this proposal does not align with our original code exemptions.

Al S. noted he does not believe it is appropriate to adopt this proposal, as it is written with a specific location in mind; Julie noted she believes that individual condo owners need to supply the alarms for their own units now, but if a unit is rented out then she believes it is up to the condominium association. Joanne noted that under the building/fire codes, condos are treated like apartments. Rodney is concerned about the possibility of open flame grills causing a fire on the condo balcony, he indicated there is data showing a disregard for this type of rule; enforcement is a challenge for local officials. Dave K. noted the proposal indicated there is an attached garage in the building, where data shows that carbon monoxide poisoning is a problem in dwelling units above the garage, and it is so specific to a particular location that it would be unenforceable.

Julie J. and Joe P. pointed out that the reasons for the current requirements were debated in detail during the earlier adoption processes; the outcome was that apartments must install the alarms, and it is unnecessary to repeat that debate. Dave K. noted that condo associations may have agreements with their tenants, but some may not comply. Al S. indicated that DOH would oppose this proposal.

Julie Johnson made a motion to disapprove Proposal 13-002. Al S. seconded the motion. Dave K. asked whether a vote was needed, or if the group had reached consensus on disapproval. The outcome was consensus to disapprove; this will be shared with the B/F/P Standing Committee on 6/13/13 and with the Council on 6/14/13. Staff will be in touch with the proponent to inform her of the outcome and the upcoming meeting dates.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:05 p.m.